

Serial No. 09/882,379  
Reply Dated May 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-148

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 17 and 30-32 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 17 and 30-32 have been amended and claims 4-6, 8, 12 and 18-29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Unless otherwise indicated in the remarks set forth below, the amendments to the claims are made for the purpose of correcting informalities and/or to more clearly define the claimed invention, and are not made for the purpose of overcoming the cited art.

The Patent Office has made the July 15, 2003 Restriction Requirement final. Accordingly, non-elected claims 13-16 and 27-29 have been canceled.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-22, 26 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,407,502 to Hidler. Claims 4, 12, 18-22 and 26 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot. The rejection of claims 1-3, 9-11, 17 and 30-31 is respectfully traversed.

Hidler fails to disclose ever claimed feature, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claim 1 discloses a plurality of light emitting pixels, wherein each of a plurality of light emitting pixels comprise a light emitting material, and wherein the light emitting material of at least one light emitting pixel has a surface area that is different than surface areas of the light emitting material of other light emitting pixels to compensate for differences in luminous efficiency

among the light emitting pixels. Claim 1 further recites a plurality of transparent anode electrodes arranged on a first site of the plurality of light emitting pixels and at least one auxiliary electrode formed on at least one anode electrode thereby forming at least one anode/auxiliary electrode combination with a lower resistivity than the anode electrode alone. Hidler fails to teach or suggest these features.

In Hidler, the size and shape of the pixel electrodes are varied in order to compensate for phosphor and/or filter efficiency. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the light emitting material of at least one light emitting pixel has as a surface area that is different than surface areas of the light emitting material of other light emitting pixels.

Further, Hidler discloses a plurality of sub-pixel row electrodes and/or a plurality of sub-pixel column electrodes that are connected to line patterned row and column electrodes, respectively, with conductive vias. In contrast, claim 1 recites at least one auxiliary electrode formed on at least one anode electrode thereby forming at least one anode/auxiliary electrode combination with a lower resistivity than the anode electrode alone.

Claim 30 recites, *inter alia*, an anode circuit for outputting a different drive voltage for RGB light emitting pixels, a cathode circuit connected to both ends of the cathode lines, for outputting the same signals, and a display unit where the area ratio of the RGB light emitting pixels and the width of the anode lines are adjusted according to characteristics of the applied drive voltage. Hidler fails to teach or suggest these features.

As discussed above, Hidler discloses using sub-pixel electrodes that are connected to row and/or column line patterned electrodes with conductive vias. Hidler does not discuss a driving circuit, other than indicating that the line patterned electrodes may extend to the edges of the substrate for electrical contact with exciting voltages. Since Hidler does not discuss the drive circuit in any detail, he does not teach or suggest varying the width of anode lines according to characteristics of the applied drive voltage, as recited in claim 30.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Hidler fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 1 and 30. Claims 2, 3, 7, 9-11 and 17 depend from claim 1, and claim 31 depends from claim 30. Thus, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For example, claim 3 recites the at least one of auxiliary electrode extends around at least one light emitting pixel. Hidler does not teach or suggest these features.

Claim 17 recites that the plurality of light emitting pixels comprise a plurality of red, green and blue light emitting pixel sets, and wherein one of said red, green, and blue light emitting pixels in each light emitting pixel set comprise first and second sub-pixels opposed along one direction and the other two light emitting pixels in each light emitting pixel set comprise third and fourth sub-pixels, respectively, opposed along another direction. Hidler does not teach or suggest these features.

Serial No. 09/882,379  
Reply Dated May 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-148

Claim 31 recites that the cathode circuit is arranged at both sides of the cathode lines for applying the same signals to the display unit. Hidler does not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 7, 9-11, 17 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 8 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hidler in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,067 to Kobayashi et al. Claims 5, 8 and 24 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hidler in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,134 to Kondo et al. Claims 6 and 25 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot.

The Office Action rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hidler in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,144,288 to Hamada et al. (hereinafter "Hamada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Hidler and Hamada fail to render obvious the subject matter of claim 7. Further, Hamada fails to remedy the deficiencies noted above in Hidler. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/882,379  
Reply Dated May 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-148

The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hidler in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,025 to Yamada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 depends from claim 30. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Hidler and Yamada fail to render obvious the subject matter of claim 32. Further, Yamada fails to remedy the deficiencies noted above in Hidler. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, René A. Vázquez, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/882,379  
Reply Dated May 11, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of December 11, 2003

Docket No. CIT/K-148

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "René A. Vázquez", is written over the printed name and firm name.

René A. Vázquez, Esq.  
Registration No. 38,647

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703-766-3701 DYK/RAV:knv  
**Date: MAY 11, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**